

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated October 15, 2004. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 19-26 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1-18 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 19-26 are being added to more specifically recite the embodiments described in the specification, especially Embodiment 3 and Fig. 5.

Additional Amendments

The Title of the Invention is being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better disclose or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being non-compliance with the specification. As claims 1-18 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection thus becomes moot.

The Title of the Invention was objected to as being non-descriptive and the Examiner requested a new title. As indicated, the Title is being amended as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejection is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) were rejected as being anticipated by Fujimaki et al. (6,097,467). The prior art references of Onishi (5,643,471), and Nagayama et al. (5,680,187) were cited as being pertinent to the present application.

As claims 1-18 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejection thus becomes moot.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that, all the prior art references cited fall far short of either anticipating or rendering obvious each and every feature of the invention as recited in the new claims 19-26. In particular, the liquid display device of the invention (Embodiment 3; Fig. 5), as recited in claim 19, is not taught or suggested by any of the cited prior art references. The liquid display device of the invention comprises: first and second substrates with a liquid crystal layer therebetween; a plurality of gate lines and a plurality of drain lines formed on the first substrate; a counter electrode and a pixel electrode formed on the first substrate and arranged in each of a plurality of pixels; a black matrix formed on the second substrate. The gate lines and an edge of the black matrix are elongated parallel to an initial orientation direction defined by an initial orientation angle, and a spacer is arranged over each of the gate lines in plane view.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344


Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200
March 15, 2005

SPF/JCM/JT